APPENDIX I.

[Vide answer to question No. 118 asked by Mr. A. Pl. N. V. Nadimuthu Pillai at the meeting of the Legislative Council, held on the 30th October 1933, page 26 supra.]

AT THE COURT AT BUCKINGHAM PALACE.

The eighth day of August, One thousand nine hundred and seventeen.

PRESENT:

The King's Most Excellent Majesty.

Lord President. Lord Colebrooke.

Lord Chamberlain. Sir Maurice De Bunsen.

Whereas there was this day read at the Board a report from the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, dated the 30th day of July 1917, in the words following, viz. :—

"Whereas by virtue of His late Majesty King Edward the Seventh's Order in Council of the 18th day of October 1909, there was referred unto this Committee the matter of an appeal from the High Court of Judicature at Madras between Subrahmania Pillai, Kuthalalinga Mudaliyar and Ramasamia Pillai appellants and the Secretary of State for India in Council (represented by the Collector of Tinnevelly) respondent (Privy Council Appeal No. 88 of 1915) and likewise a humble petition of the appellants setting forth that on the 6th March 1902 the first and second appellants and two other persons as *dharmakartas* of Tirukuthalanathaswami temple at Courtallam, Tenkasi taluk, instituted a suit in the Court of the Additional Subordinate Judge at Tinnevelly against the respondent for a decree declaring their title as *dharmakartas* of the temple to the properties specified in the schedule to the plaint for possession and other relief; that the Court of the Subordinate Judge on the 17th March 1906 passed a decree declaring that the temple was entitled by right of ownership to certain portions of the property claimed: that the first and second appellants appealed to the High Court against so much of the decree as was against them; that the respondent also appealed against the decree, that the appeals were heard together and the High Court on the 18th November 1910, passed a decree reversing the decree of the Court of the Subordinate Judge and dismissing the suit; that the first and second appellants obtained leave to appeal to your Majesty in Council that the third appellant was added as an appellant he having become an additional trustee of the temple; and humbly praying your Majesty in Council to take their appeal into consideration and that the decree of the High Court, dated the 18th November 1910, may be reversed, altered or varied or for further or other relief in the premises:

"The Lords of the Committee in obedience to His late Majesty's said Order in Council have taken the humble petition and appeal into consideration and having heard Counsel on behalf of the parties on both

30th October 1933]

sides their Lordships do this day agree humbly to report to your Majesty as their opinion that by consent this appeal ought to be dismissed and the decree of the High Court of Judicature at Madras, dated the 18th day of November 1910, except as to costs affirmed upon the following terms: (1) that the respondent will grant to the appellants the whole of the disputed site lying to the west of the river-bed including the site and buildings of the Santiavanthana mandapam and Kasilingaswami shrine (Nos. 4 and 5 on plan, Exhibit P) and also the Tirthavari mandapam and its verandahs (Nos. 6 and 7 on plan, Exhibit P) being respectively the parcels of land specified as A and C in the decree of the Court of the Subordinate Judge, (2) that the respondent will also grant to the appellants liberty to carry on all customary rights of worship at the falls pool and adjoining sites belonging to the respondent with such liberty of access as heretofore enjoyed, (3) that the respondent declares his intention to safeguard any rights or user and access of the public of and to the pool and other sites belonging to the respondent, and (4) that the parties do bear their own costs in both the Courts below and of this appeal."

His Majesty having taken the said report into consideration was pleased by and with the advice of His Privy Council to approve thereof and to order as it is hereby ordered that the same be punctually observed, obeyed and carried into execution.

Whereof the Judges of the High Court of Judicature at Madras for the time being and all other persons whom it may concern are to take notice and govern themselves accordingly.

ALMERIC FITZROY.

APPENDIX II.

[Vide answer to question No. 120 asked by Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 30th October 1933, page 27 supra.]

AGREEMENT made this 20th day of November 1931 between the Secretary of State for India in Council (hereinafter called the Secretary of State) of the one part and (1) Shanthiraja alias Appu Kambli, president, (2) Dharmaraja Kottari, (3) Adiraja Balipa, (4) Jinnappa Hegade and (5) J. A. Rodrigues, members of a panchayat formed for the purposes hereinafter mentioned, being residents in the villages specified against their names in the Karkal taluk, North Mangalore division (hereinafter called the panchayat), of the other part.

WHEREAS the Government of Madras desire to enlist the co-operation of the villagers in the conservation of forest reserves which remain under departmental control and have agreed with the panchayat in consideration of its assistance against fire and other damage in Todar